



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

WT

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/879, 322 06/20/97 HODGSON

A 14136

EXAMINER

WM31/0829

RAYMOND M. MEHLET
COOK, ALEX, MCFARRON, MANZO, CUMMINGS &
200 W. ADAMS, SUITE 2850
CHICAGO IL 60606

DASTOLIET, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2623
DATE MAILED:

27

08/29/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Advisory Action	Application No. 08/879,322	Applicant(s) Hodgson et al	Examiner Mehrdad Dastouri	Art Unit 2623	
	-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --				
	THE REPLY FILED <u>Aug 15, 2001</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.				
Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.					
THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]					
a) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 706.07 (f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>					
1. <input type="checkbox"/> A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.					
3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:					
(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See NOTE below);					
(b) <input type="checkbox"/> they raise the issue of new matter. (See NOTE below);					
(c) <input type="checkbox"/> they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) <input type="checkbox"/> they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
<p>NOTE: <u>See Attached.</u></p> <hr/>					
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
<hr/>					
5. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).					
6. <input type="checkbox"/> The a) <input type="checkbox"/> affidavit, b) <input type="checkbox"/> exhibit, or c) <input type="checkbox"/> request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:					
<hr/>					
7. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.					
8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):					
Claim(s) allowed: _____					
Claim(s) objected to: _____					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10 and 12-20</u>					
9. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ a) <input type="checkbox"/> has b) <input type="checkbox"/> has not been approved by the Examiner.					
10. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.					
11. <input type="checkbox"/> Other:					

Art Unit: 2623

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on August 21, 2001 will not be entered because the proposed amendment (e.g., Claim 1, Lines 2, 3, 6, 12, 13, 16 and 17) requires further search and consideration.
2. Applicants' argument regarding withdrawal of the finality of the present Office Action have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The present Office Action has been made FINAL based on Applicants' amendment filed May 21, 2001 necessitated new grounds of rejection. The amendment filed on May 21, 2001 recites the new limitation in Claim 1 concerning "a fruit matrix selected from the group consisting of a sugar matrix, a starch matrix or a sugar and starch matrix used in fruit fillings, toppings, dairy products or cooked food products". In comparison with the broad limitation of "fruit particles in a matrix" recited in the once amended original Claim 1, this limitation substantially changed the claimed invention and necessitated new grounds of rejection.



AMELIE M. AU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

MD
Mehrdad Dastouri
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2623
August 22, 2001